REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-37 remain pending. Claims 1-37 stand rejected.

Claims 35, and 37 are amended. No claims have been canceled. No claims have been added. Applicants submit that no new matter is added herein as amendment to claims 35, and 37 are supported at least at paragraph 35, 45 and 47 of the application as originally filed. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of claims 1-37 in view of at least the following remarks.

I. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Patent Office rejects claims 1-5, 12-14, 16, 18-25, 27, 29, 30-31 and 34-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,947,014 to Wooten ("Wooten") in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0154070 to Sato et al. (Sato). For claim to be obvious each limitation of that claim must be taught by at least one properly combined reference.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection above for independent claims 1, 6, 12, 19, 23, for at least the reason that the cited references do not teach or enable video privacy logic within the computing device, wherein detecting the user has coupled the HID comprises detecting a product identification code of the HID, as required by the independent claims (claim 1 used representatively here).

Wooten requires a monitor auto-blanking system that is part of the eyewear display system 10, where the blanking system makes the user's computer screen go blank (see Abstract, Figure 1, and Col. 3, lines 34-40). For example, a principle of operation of Wooten is that the eyewear display system "is capable of attaching to any standard video connector, to provide the convenience of universal connection to computer systems." Consequently, it is against the principle of operation of Wooten noted above to have the privacy logic to disable the primary display and route video display data to the HID, within the computing device, as required by claim 1. Moreover, Wooten does not describe or teach detecting a product identification code of the HID as required by the amended claims.

Sato teaches that a user inputs an ID code which is checked against a recorded list of a series of ID codes which are granted permission to use a system (see paragraph 180 in Figure 23). Users who have passed this primary screening may be randomly selected and allowed to play (see paragraph 180). Thus, the ID codes may be supplied with a game product with a like associated with broad cast contents, or distributed as a gift of some product to improve incentive for purchasing a product (see paragraph 181). However, there is no teaching or enablement in Sato that the identification is a product identification code of the human interface device (HID) as required by claim 1. Instead, all that is required in Sato, is that the identification code is applied to a user to provide permission for that user to play (regardless of what device is used) (see paragraph 180), and that the digits of the ID code can express codes much larger than the actual distributed quantity of products (see paragraph 181). Consequently, the ID code in Sato appears to be more of a "serial number" based identification where only one exists per product, broadcast, or gift.

Moreover, by including the claimed detection of the identification code, embodiments described in the specification of the application, for example, without limitation thereto, provide the benefits of: (1) allowing the computer to confirm that a privacy device has been detected, and blanking the computer's screen using a signal based on the identification code (e.g., see paragraph 45 of the specification and claim 35); (2) identifying the privacy device product by code, thus allowing the computer to configure the video data for transmission and output to specific products using various buses and interfaces (e.g., see paragraphs 38 and 45, and claim 36); (3) such as by supporting data coherency based on the identification code via "snooping" and performing address translation (e.g., see paragraph 35 and claim 37). However, the references do not teach or enable such benefits.

For claim 1, it can also be appreciated that a benefit of receiving such product identification codes and allowing the computing device to configure the data for various HID's according to or based on the identification codes received, such that it is not necessary for the properties of the HID screen to be manipulated by the eyewear display system, such as required at col. 4, lines 11-19 of Wooten. In addition, it can be appreciated that a benefit of using a product identification code of the HID as required by amended claim 1 is that the above benefits can be realized without assigning, recording, generating, or processing data for a larger number of "serial number" type

identification codes as required by Sato. However, the references do not teach or enable such benefits.

In addition to being dependent upon allowable base claim 12, Applicants disagree with the rejection above of claim 16 for at least the reason that the cited references do not disclose or teach enabling the primary display device when the privacy device is uncoupled from the port of the computing device. Wooten teaches retracting the connection device for easy storage (see col. 3, lines 41-42). However, the Patent Office has not identified and Applicants are unable to find any teaching in Wooten of the above noted limitation of claim 16. Specifically, there is no description, disclosure, or enablement of such capability in Wooten.

In addition to being dependent upon allowable base claim 12, Applicants disagree with the rejection above for claim 18. An argument analogous to the one above for claim 16 applies here as well, but with respect to monitoring whether the privacy device continues to be coupled to the port, as required by claim 18. Specifically, there is no description, disclosure, teaching or enablement of such monitoring in Wooten.

In addition to being dependent upon allowable base claim 12, Applicants disagree with the rejection above of claim 31 for at least the reason that the references do not teach prompting the user with the primary display device to inquire whether the HID is a privacy device as required by claim 31. It can be appreciated that such an embodiment, without limitation thereto, provides the advantage of allowing the computing device to control blanking of the display device and sending of the video signal to the HID, such as using various interfaces and for various HID's (e.g., see paragraphs 38, 46, and 50-53). However, none of the references teach or enable such benefits.

In addition to being dependent upon allowable base claim 1, applicants disagree with the rejection of claim 35, as amended, for at least reason that the cited references do not teach disabling the primary displayed device comprising the logic initiating a signal based on the product identification code to cause the primary display device to become disabled, as required by amended claim 35. In addition to not teaching detecting a product identification code of the HID, the references also failed to teach the above-noted limitations of claim 35, or the advantages thereof as noted above with respect to claim 1.

The Patent Office rejects claims 15, 17, 26 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wooten and Sato in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0045484 to Eck, et al. ("Eck").

Applicants disagree with the rejection above to claim 17 for at least the reason that, in addition to being dependent upon allowable base claim 12, claim 17 requires one of start sending video display data to the primary display device, stop sending blank screen data to the primary display device and stop sending splash screen data to the primary display device. An argument analogous to the one above for claim 16 applies here as well, but with respect to the above noted limitation of claim 17. That is, the references do not describe, disclose, teach, enable, or make obvious the above noted limitations of claim 17.

The Patent Office has not identified and Applicants are unable to find any teaching in ECK that cures the failure of the references noted above.

The Patent Office rejects claims 6-11 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wooten and Sato in view of US Patent Publication 2005/0012749 to Gonzalez et al. (Gonzalez). Applicants disagree with the rejection of these claims for at least the reasons noted above for claim 1. Moreover, Gonzalez fails to cure the failures of Wooten noted above for claim 1.

The Patent Office rejects claim 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wooten and Sato in view of Gonzalez in claims 6-11 and 33, further in view of US Patent Publication 2004/0201544 to Love et al. (Love).

Love fails to cure the deficiencies noted above for the references.

In addition to being dependent upon allowable base claim 12, Applicants disagree with the rejection above of claim 32 for at least the reason that the cited reference does not disclose detecting coupling of a second HID to a second port of the computing device as required by claim 32. It can be appreciated that a benefit of such an embodiment, without limitation thereto, includes allowing multiple users to view a private display (e.g., see paragraph 33 of the specification). However, the cited references do not disclose or describe such benefits.

In addition to being dependent upon allowable base claim 1, applicants submit that claim 37, as amended, is patentable over the cited references for at least the reason that the references do not teach logic that supports data coherency between the HID and the computing device based on the product identification code via "snooping" and

performing address translation as required by amended claim 37. In addition to not teaching receiving a product identification for the HID as noted above for claim 1 none of the references teaches the noted limitations of amended claim 37 or benefits thereof, such as noted above for claim 1.

Any dependent claims not mentioned herein are submitted as not being anticipated or obvious for at least the same reasons given in support of their base claims, as well as for the additional limitations required by each dependent claim. Hence, Applicants respectfully request that the Patent Office withdraw the rejections above for any dependent claims.

Hence, for at least the reasons above, Applicants respectfully request the Patent Office withdraw the rejection above.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending (1) are in proper form, (2) are neither obvious nor anticipated by the relied upon art of record, and (3) are in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would be useful in moving the application forward to allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (310) 207-3800.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17, particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR, & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 6/26/08

By: _____
Angelo J. Gaz, Reg. No. 45,907

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
Telephone (310) 207-3800
Facsimile (408) 720-8383

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this paper is being transmitted online via EFS Web to the Patent and Trademark Office, Commissioner for Patents, Post Office Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450.

Christine Flores 6/26/08
Christine Flores Date